



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,212	04/09/2004	Gregory A. Piccione	39003.816US01	1326
7590	12/14/2009		EXAMINER	
Michael M. Gerardi, Esq. 28876 Woodcrest Lake Drive Menifee, CA 92584			NGUYEN, QUYNH H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/14/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/822,212	PICCIONELLI, GREGORY A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	QUYNH H. NGUYEN	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE and amendment filed 10/5/09.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's RCE and amendment filed 10/5/09 has been entered. No claims have been amended. No claims have been added. No claims have been canceled. Claims 1-4 are still pending in this application, with claims 1-4 being independent.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1-4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendricks et al. (U.S. Patent 6,675,386) in view of Roberts et al. (US 2003/0095183) and further in view of Ito et al. (2003/0020824).

As to claims 1 and 3, Hendricks et al. teaches the steps of: a central cite (remote site 102) connected to network (Fig. 1, web site 112); a plurality of cameras (Fig. 1, cameras 102', 102'', 104', 104'') disposed about an event site, the cameras providing view of the event site from at least two different camera angles (col. 5, lines 27-38), the cameras providing video feeds to the central site via the network (see abstract; col. 3, line 65 through col. 4, line 8), and

means for enabling a user to access the central site and to selectively view the event site by means of at least two of the plurality of cameras (see abstract; col. 18, line 62 through col. 19, line 4; please throughout the patent).

Hendricks does not explicitly teach a processor generating a smooth transitional view between at least two of the plurality of cameras, whereby a continuous change of camera angle is provided.

Roberts teaches a processor generating a smooth transitional view between at least two of the plurality of cameras (*two adjacent cameras*) (abstract; [0004] and [0011] - *where Roberts discussed upon movement of the target, cameras' images displayed on the monitor whereby target image continuity maintained*). In the same field of endeavor, Ito teaches the camera execute a smooth focus when the camera angle is changed continuously to follow a moving object ([0008]) when the camera shifted from one scene to another, the focus, zoom and iris settings of the camera are changed smoothly so that images with smooth scene changes will be obtained ([0035]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of the camera execute a smooth focus follow-up operation when the camera angle is changed continuously to follow a moving object of Ito and the teachings of Roberts into the teachings of Hendricks with a plurality of cameras for the purpose of making it possible for the camera to execute a smooth focus follow up operation when the camera angle is changed continuously to follow a moving object maintain target image continuity that displayed on the monitor.

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 3. Furthermore, Hendricks et al. teaches means for sequentially recording the feeds from the at least two of the plurality of cameras (col. 5, lines 34-43; col. 19, lines 10-16).

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1-4 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-25 of copending Application No. 11/516250. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the present application are broader in scope than the claims of the patent. Omission of an element and its function in a combination is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same functions as before. In re KARLSON (CCPA) 136 USPA 184 (1963).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to QUYNH H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-272-7489. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on 571-272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/822,212
Art Unit: 2614

Page 6

/Quynh H Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614